



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

One action of the Executive Committee may be recorded here. The Committee expressed its deep satisfaction at the account, to be found in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 14.190-191, of the Classical Investigation now in progress under the direction of the American Classical League, and the Secretary-Treasurer was directed to convey to the League a statement to that effect, and the good wishes of the Association for the complete success of the investigation.

The following officers were elected: President, Professor Helen H. Tanzer, Hunter College; Secretary-Treasurer, Professor Charles Knapp; Vice-Presidents, Professor Cleveland K. Chase, Hamilton College, Clinton, New York, Professor Willis P. Woodman, Hobart College, Geneva, New York, Mr. Charles Huntington Smith, Morristown School, Morristown, New Jersey, Dr. A. W. Howes, Central High School, Philadelphia, Professor Evan T. Sage, University of Pittsburgh, Miss Cora A. Pickett, High School, Wilmington, Delaware, Professor C. W. E. Miller, The Johns Hopkins University, Miss Mildred Dean, Central High School, Washington, D. C. These officers, together with the retiring President, Professor D. M. Robinson, constitute the Executive Committee for the year. Professor Knapp holds over as Representative of the Association on the Council of the American Classical League.

C. K.

REVIEWS

The Genitive of Value in Latin and Other Constructions with Verbs of Rating. By Gordon J. Laing. Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press (1920). Pp. viii + 48.

This monograph deals with our old friends *lanti*, *quanti*, *pluris*, and *minoris et id genus omne*. The investigation is limited, as the title indicates, to verbs of 'rating', but this term has been construed elastically, for in the list of over twenty verbs there are some (notably *esse*) which are not strictly verbs of 'rating'. Verbs of 'buying' and 'selling', *refert*, and *interest* have not been included.

The types of expressions which have been examined are (for the genitive) A. The Attributive Genitive of Valuation with Substantives: (1) with an adjective accompanying the genitive, e. g. *magni preti servus*; (2) without an adjective, e. g. *homo nihili*; B. Genitive in the Predicate: (1) indefinite valuation, e. g. *te magni facio*; (2) expressions of worthlessness, e. g. *nihili sum*; (3) definite valuation (rare), e. g. *an emat denario quod sit mille denarium* (Cicero).

The purpose of the investigation is, to quote the Preface,

(1) to determine the origin of the genitive of value and (2) to ascertain the limits of the different combinations: what genitives and ablatives are used in expressions of valuation and with what verbs they are combined; and to what extent genitives, ablatives, and verbs vary in different authors and different spheres.

The work involves therefore contributions to lexicography and 'stylistic' as well as to historical syntax. The material is not complete, but nobody would demand this of such an investigation. The collections represent the language fairly well from the beginning of the literature to the end of the Augustan Age. For the first and the second centuries of the Empire they are less full. For later Latin only parts of about a dozen writers, from Tertullian to Gregory of Tours, have been excerpted. Thus Professor Laing has merely aimed to examine enough material to give validity to his results. The gaps in the material probably do not affect the surmises concerning the origin of the genitive of value, since the expressions investigated are already completely developed in the early literature, but the later history and the by-products of the work would be greatly supplemented and somewhat modified by the addition of more material.

The work of other scholars referred to here and there throughout the monograph consists chiefly of Grammars and Handbooks. A few special articles are mentioned, but not one of the numerous dissertations on the genitive or the ablative is cited. Some of these would have been useful at least for them collections. Perhaps the author includes them under his reference (in the Preface) "to other sources", or perhaps it was less laborious to use indices and special lexica.

The material is arranged under functional categories with subdivisions established on the basis of form. This arrangement separates phenomena which from one point of view belong together, e. g. *nihili* (attributive), *nihili* with verbs, and *pro nihilo*; but no classification can satisfy all requirements and in the present case the total amount of material is so moderate that with the aid of the numerous cross-references, the Index, and the list of verbs it is easy to obtain quickly a view of any given formal group.

Professor Laing begins his first chapter, The Genitive of Value (1-30), the most important part of the work, with a discussion and critique of theory; he closes it with a summary statement of his own view (1-8). Then follows the material on which his conclusions are based. The various theories which have been held with regard to the origin of the genitive of valuation, as Professor Laing terms the construction, are all examined in the light of the material and are all found unsatisfactory. The theory of a locative origin for this genitive is considered correct only in that it recognizes the original "adverbial character of the construction". The theory of partitive origin is adequate only as an explanation of the type *pensi ducere*. But the author devotes most of his critique to the theory that the genitive of value is derived from the genitive of quality. This is the view which has been generally held, but Professor Laing finds it unsatisfactory for four reasons. (1) No development of *magni preti* (by the dropping of *preti*) into *magni* (*lanti*, *pluris*, etc.) can be traced in extant Latin, for both types appear in the earliest Latin, and, furthermore, *magni preti esse* (*esse* is the only verb used with this type by Plautus), instead of decreasing,

tends to increase as time goes on, other nouns (*ponderis*, etc.) and other verbs entering into the construction. (2) This theory does not, in his opinion, explain the phrases *boni consulere*, *aequi bonique facere*, and *pensi ducere*, of which the first two are very old and the last is partitive in origin. (3) It does not explain *nihili* (*floci*, *nauci*, etc.) with verbs of rating, for here we have nouns without an adjective, although the adjective is "an element of the utmost constancy" with the genitive of quality. (4) No genitive of quality has been proved for Indo-European; e. g. in Homer the nearest approach to it is the genitive of material. Hence, says Professor Laing, we may conclude that the genitive of value arose in Latin without the influence of the genitive of quality, as it certainly did in Greek.

The most recent view (Wackernagel's, accepted by Bennett, *Syntax of Early Latin*, 2.93 ff.) is that the forms *multi*, *magni*, *parvi*, etc., were not originally genitives at all, but were forms parallel to the Sanskrit forms in *-i* which combine with the roots 'make', 'become', and 'be' to form phrases which mean 'to make or become something', 'to make or become a participant of something', 'to bring or come within the field of something'. In Latin, when these *-i*-forms had become identified with genitives, other real genitives (*pluris*, *minoris*, etc.) followed suit, and other verbs (*pendere*, *aestimare*, etc.) were added. Professor Laing thinks (7) that this theory is correct "in regarding the genitive of value as originally adverbial" and "in its implicit recognition of certain points of contact between the genitive of value and the partitive genitive", but he cannot believe that "such simple concepts" as *pluris esse* and *minoris esse* are late analogical expressions, not to mention the free combination in Latin of other genitive forms (*-ae*, *-arum*) with verbs of rating.

Professor Laing's own view is that the function of valuation "belonged to the genitive as a whole"; that (7) it is " . . . One of Several Instances of the Free Use of the Genitive with Verbs Expressing Various Phases of Connection or Relation". He objects (8) to attempts to derive all functions of the genitive from one or two original forces; rather "the original function of the genitive was of wide range", the possessive being "one phase, the partitive, another, the genitive of valuation another", and he believes that there were still others. . . . they are a series of conterminous groups, for the most part distinct but at some points merging into one another by subtle indistinguishable stages. . . . Thus "the most characteristic type of the genitive of value" consisted of *magni*, *boni*, *nihili*, etc., combined with *facere*, *pendere*, etc., but the field was enlarged by contributions from the partitive genitive (compare *aequi*, *boni*, *pensi*) and also —after the construction had become established— from the genitive of quality, for "any genitive of quality in which the noun was a word meaning or connoting value (e. g., *res magni preti*) was substantially a genitive of value".

One may approve much of this criticism and yet believe that the genitive of value is a variety of the

genitive of quality— "eine Abart des Genetivus qualitatis", as Wölfflin (quoted by Laing, page 2) says. The positive arguments against this view, which I have summarized, prove that it must be modified, not rejected. Professor Laing is right in denying that the type *magni*, *pluris*, etc., arose from *magni preti*, *pluris preti*, etc., by omission of *preti*. The strong argument here is the existence of both these types fully developed in the earliest Latin and the Greek parallels *πλεῖτον*, *πλεονος*. But it may be remarked in passing that the priority of *magni preti* in preliterate times is not disproved, as Professor Laing seems to think, by its persistence in literary times. The truth is merely that both constructions were vital enough to persist, neither being able to drive the other from the field, but this throws no light on the question which was the original construction.

The argument based on *boni consulere*, etc., is inconsistent with Professor Laing's own (correct) attitude that the genitive of value has points of contact with other functions of the case. He believes that these phrases are partitive in origin, although in general the genitive of value is not derived from the partitive function. The champion of the view that in general the genitive of value is a variety of the genitive of quality has the same right to except these phrases. Moreover, *boni consulere* does not seem to be partitive in origin (see below).

The absence of an adjective with *nihili*, *floci*, etc., does indeed "separate them from the class of the genitive of quality" (5), as we know it in the literature, but in discussing the origin of these constructions we are getting back into preliterate times. Moreover, these old formulae are themselves distinctly adjectival and so do not need an adjective.

The argument drawn from comparative philology is necessarily inconclusive. Even if we believe that the genitive of quality did not exist in Indo-European, it certainly existed—how early we do not know—in pre-literate Latin, and the argument drawn by analogy from the facts of Greek does not establish more than the possibility of a parallel development in Latin.

Furthermore, there are positive arguments in favor of the priority and the domination of the genitive of quality. Professor Laing admits a close connection and a reciprocal influence between the two constructions, although in his opinion they arose separately. But can they ever have been separate in any real sense? The genitive of value is to the genitive of quality as sub-species to species. 'Quality' ('description') is the more general, the more inclusive, concept. It is easy to conceive of the descriptive, qualifying force of the case as passing into a valuative function, but very difficult to conceive this valuative function as essentially independent and equally early. This, however, is mere *a priori* argument. The real bond between the constructions as shown by the actual material is that very often both have in common an adjectival force. Professor Laing approaches the material by way of the

verbs with which the genitives occur and regards the genitives as adverbial. Even more important are the substantives (nouns, pronouns, etc.) which the genitives often qualify. This adjectival relation is obvious when the genitive is attributive. So, e. g. *homo nihili* has already become in early Latin so completely adjectival that *nihili* may be modified by an adverb: compare Plautus, Merc. 125 *nimis nihili tibicen siem*.

Let us illustrate the same relation among the predicative cases. The verb 'rates' something as valuable or worthless in comparison with some standard expressed or implied, so that the genitive, which expresses the verdict, is often equivalent to a predicate adjective or a predicate appositive (with *esse* a predicate nominative). Many of the verbs in Professor Laing's list are construed not only with the genitive of value, but also with the genitive of quality and with other expressions, as he himself points out. Excluding *esse*¹, most of these verbs mean broadly 'think', 'deem', 'consider'; compare *aestimare*, *ducere*, *existimare*, *putare*. When the verdict is one of valuation, involving always words denoting degree, quantity, number, etc., the verb may be called a verb of 'rating'. Here, then, 'valuation' becomes one phase of a broader category which we term 'descriptive', 'qualitative', 'characteristic', etc., or (in terms of grammatical relation), 'adjectival'. With *aestimo*, for example, the verdict of valuation takes the following forms²: (a) the genitive (1) of a substantive adjective, e. g. *magni aestimo unius aestatis fructum* (Cicero), (2) of a substantive (to express worthlessness), e. g. *me esse mortuum nihili aestimo* (Cicero), (3) of an adjective and a substantive, e. g. *rumores . . . unius aestimemus assis* (Catullus); (b) the ablative of (1) a substantive adjective, e. g. *magno te aestimaturum si scire . . . posses* (Livy); (2) a substantive, e. g. *quidquid homines vita aestimant* (Curtius); (3) a substantive (to express worthlessness), e. g. *honores eorum nihilo aestimant* (Seneca); (4) an adjective and a substantive, e. g. *magno ubique pretio virtus aestimatur* (Valerius Maximus); (c) a substantive in predicate apposition, e. g. *tam quam lutum aestimabitur argentum* (Augustine); (d) an adverb, e. g. *propter amorem carius sunt aestimata* (Plancus apud Ciceronem, Ad Fam. 10.4.2). See the Thesaurus for a long list of adverbs.

If, however, *aestimo* means 'consider', 'deem'—the broader meaning —, the verdict concerning the object or, if the verb is passive, the subject, takes the following forms: (A) the genitive of an adjective and substantive, e. g. *alicuius nominis aestimabar* (Hieronymus): compare above, a, 3; (B) a predicate adjective, e. g. *quod iuvat, quod carum aestumant, id semper faciunt* (Sallust): compare above, a, 1 and 2; (C) a predicate

appositive noun or adjective, e. g. *alienam famam . . . suum dedecus aestimant* (Pseudo-Sallust); compare above, c; (D) a prepositional phrase with the ablative, e. g. *Aegyptios . . . pro sociis ipsos aestimatuos* (Curtius: this construction does not happen to occur with *aestimo* to express value, but it occurs with several other verbs of 'rating', e. g. *puto, duco, habeo*); (E) an adverb, e. g. *divitiae non melius . . . aestimantur* (Apuleius): compare above, d; (F) accusative and infinitive—very common.

Thus the relation of both the genitive of value and the genitive of quality to the object of the verb (the subject of *esse* or a passive form) is predominantly adjectival, and the constructions run closely parallel courses whether the verb has the more general meaning 'deem' or the more special meaning 'rate'. The genitive displays a decided affinity for the substantive. Furthermore, valuation is often expressed by real adjectives; compare *carus, pretiosus, vilis*, etc., and these adjectives, because of their meanings, naturally do not have to be placed in the genitive case. Moreover, Quintilian evidently felt the genitive in the old phrase *boni consulere* to be adjectival, for he says (1.6.32), *rogat boni consulas, id est bonum iudices*. In general, the genitive answers the question, Of what sort, quality, value, etc.? Yet at times the point of view is adverbial. Hence with many of the verbs an adverb may be used to express 'value', 'quality', etc., e. g. *valde care aestimas tot annos* (Cicero).

Professor Laing has been struck by the fact that other constructions besides the genitive are used to express value, and he has included a full collection of ablatives together with rather meager lists of prepositional phrases (*pro, in, cum*) and adverbs. The collection of ablatives supports the old rule that in expressions of valuation the genitive is indefinite, the ablative definite, but there are enough exceptions to show that the difference in meaning between the two cases was very slight. He believes that the ablative with verbs of 'rating' (which regularly have a genitive) is due to the influence of the ablative of price (originally means). As in the case of the genitive, the words occurring with the ablative often denote degree, quantity, number, etc.—indeed they are often the same words; e. g. *we* have both *magni* and *magno* (*aestimare*, etc.), *parvi* and *parvo*, *nihili* and *nihilo*, *maioris* and *maiore*, etc. The only adjectives used alone with the ablative which do not occur in Professor Laing's lists with the genitive are *caro, vili* (*vilissimo*). Doubtless this identity of the words involved had much to do with the overlapping of the constructions.

Now, if we ask what relation these ablatives bear to the substantive which is 'rated', we find that they are not, like the genitives, predominantly adjectival. There are no attributive ablatives—no *homo nihilo* to correspond with *homo nihili*. The cases are all predicative, and the ablative shows an affinity for the verb. If the genitive usually answers the question, Of what sort, value, etc.?, the ablative usually answers the question,

¹*Esse* was undoubtedly, as Professor Laing says, one of the earliest verbs used in this construction, and, so far as the genitive is concerned, the illustrations given below would be more varied and even clearer, if one were to include the constructions with *esse*. I have chosen *aestimare*, however, because it is a typical verb of 'rating'.

²See Professor Laing's lists and the Thesaurus, s. v. *aestimo*.

How do I rate him, etc.? And yet the ablative also approaches closely at times to an adjective. A thing or a person could be rated as worth a sesterce; compare *divitiæ, gratia, potentia sestertio nummo aestimanda sunt* (Seneca). The same idea could be expressed by an adjective; compare *sestertiarius homo* (Petronius). With this in turn compare the 'three-fig aedile', *aedilem trium cauniarum* (Petronius). The development was the same as that with which we are familiar in such phrases as 'ten-cent cigar', 'no-account niggah'. This occasional affinity of the ablative for the substantive, especially when the words are identical and the idea is indefinite, is a striking indication of the overlapping of these constructions and is due in all probability to the influence of the genitive upon the ablative. Among the prepositional expressions also there are several which were felt as closely akin to an adjective, e. g. *res humanæ tenues ac pro nihilo pulantur* (Cicero—note *tenues ac*), or an appositive, e. g. the phrase *pro luto habere* or *esse* as compared with *tamquam lutum aestimabitur argentum*.

Professor Laing's monograph opens up a wide field. To clear up the whole subject it would be necessary to include in the investigation all the methods by which valuation and the wider concept of quality are expressed, especially the genitive of quality, the descriptive ablative, the adjectives *carus, pretiosus, vilis*, etc., adverbs, and appositives. But—*vita brevis!* We must be grateful to Professor Laing for what he has given us.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE.

ARTHUR L. WHEELER.

The "Chronica Fratris Jordani a Giano". A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of Letters of the Catholic University of America. By Rev. Edwin J. Auweiler, O. F. M. Washington, D. C. (1917). Pp. 64.

The contents of this dissertation are as follows: Preface (5-6); History of the Chronicle of Jordan of Giano (7); The Manuscripts (8-12); Indirect Sources of the Text (13-15); The Editions (16-19); The Life of Jordan (20-44); The Latin Text of the Present Edition (45-53); Apparatus Criticus (54-60); Bibliography (61-63); Vita (64).

Jordan's Chronicle, written in the latter half of the thirteenth century, is an account of the "coming of the first friars into Germany and <of> their lives and their deeds".

In his discussion of the life of Jordan Dr. Auweiler discusses the Latinity of Jordan. In so doing he treats one phase of Latinity which will interest classical students. Henry Boehmer, in his edition of the *Chronica Fratris Jordani*, which was published in *Collection d'Études et de Documents sur l'Histoire Religieuse et Littéraire du Moyen Âge*, 6 (Paris, 1908), suggested that Jordan's Latin is heavy and shows signs of being deeply affected by the vernacular Italian just then coming into its status as a modern language. He had even ventured to say that a number of Jordan's expressions are 'Italian vulgarisms', and argued from this that

Jordan was an Italian without much culture. In contradiction to this Dr. Auweiler has pointed out how many of the examples cited by Boehmer to prove his contention are really adoptions or adaptations from the Latin of the Scriptures, though most of them have behind them the authority also of recognized good Latin writers. The partitive expressions with *de*, for instance, used instead of the genitive, which came into usage in the modern languages, is of quite respectable antiquity and can be found frequently among Latin writers of the classical as well as of the post-classical time. Dr. Auweiler has given a number of examples. The use of *subito* in the sense of 'all at once' or 'quickly' is found in Cicero, as well as in the Latin Vulgate. The use of the preposition *de*, in the sense of *secundum*, is not a modern Italianism, but is found in Suetonius, Tibullus, and Caesar. The expression *in sero* need not be a vulgarism or a modernism, for *serum*, in almost precisely that sense, is used by Livy and Suetonius. *Culpo* in the sense of 'blaming', impugned by Boehmer as an Italian vulgarism, will be found used "in this sense by such ancient Italians as Plautus, Ovid, Horace, Suetonius, Quintillian and others".

In a word, Dr. Auweiler has brought out the fact that the style of medieval writers, so largely influenced by the Scriptures, is not nearly so distant from ancient Latin as is usually thought when students limit the comparison to the Latin classical writers. Jordan very frequently uses the ablative absolute and other participial constructions, but this, too, is probably due to the influence of the Scriptures, for, as Miss Stawell pointed out in an article on Luke The Evangelist, who, she suggests, was a Latin and probably a relative of Vergil, Luke uses the genitive absolute in his Greek gospel in a way that is characteristic of Latin rather than of Greek, but in a way that deeply influenced the style of the Latin scriptures.

NEW YORK CITY.

JAMES J. WALSH, M.D.

THE NEW YORK CLASSICAL CLUB The Classical Forum

A meeting of The Classical Forum of The New York Classical Club was held in Students' Hall, Barnard College, Saturday, March 12, at 10:30 A. M. The general topic of discussion was The Measurement of Results in Latin Instruction. Two papers were presented—the first, by Dr. Barclay W. Bradley, of the College of the City of New York, who spoke of Recent Experiments in Standard Tests, the second by Mr. Robert Raiman, of the Boys' High School, Brooklyn, who reported the results of his experience with the Otis Intelligence Tests.

Dr. Bradley began by reminding his audience of the need for objective standards of judgment of pupils' work, as evidenced by the hopeless divergence in subjective judgments of the same work by teachers. The beginning in Latin had been made under the direction of Professor Hanus, who published two tests, one of vocabulary, and the other of translation of detached sentences. These tests did not fully meet the requirements, in that the material used was somewhat arbitrarily selected, and the scale-values of the various